

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 14-16, and 18-20 stand rejected and claims 6-7, 12-13, and 17 are objected to. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6-7, 12-13, and 17 but refrains from rewriting these claims in independent form until final resolution of the claims from which they depend. By this Amendment, claim 12 has been amended. The amendments made to claim 12 have been made to correct typographical errors. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claim 12 is objected to due to a typographical error. Applicant has corrected the typographical error and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,091 ("Wallentin"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose every element of the claim, as arranged in the claim, and in sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the anticipated subject matter. See, PPG Industries, Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp., 75 F.3d 1558, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996); C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998). A reference that does not expressly disclose all of the elements of a claimed invention cannot anticipate unless all of the undisclosed elements are inherently present in the reference. See, Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 942 F.2d 1264, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Among the limitations of the independent claims not present in the cited reference is as relay node list held by the node, as a pair, ID information on said terminal station and a relay source node included in the uplink packet transmitted by said terminal station in each of said core node and said relay node.

The Office Action asserts that this limitation is disclosed in Wallentin at col. 5, ln. 56 - col. 6, ln. 19. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In this cited portion of Wallentin, a system having a plurality of adjacent cells is disclosed where each cell has a base station. A dedicated radio channel is allocated to a mobile station and a handover procedure is employed to maintain the connection when the mobile station transfers from one base station to another. The transfer is handled from a signaling point of view. A shared radio channel associated with a shared radio service is selected for a traffic or where a packet transfer delay is acceptable. When the mobile station enters a new cell, a registration message is sent to the associated network. However, these messages may produce as much traffic or even more traffic than the user data traffic. Alternatively, if the mobile station changes routing areas, a routing area registration message is sent to the nearest base station. The network stores the routing area ID number where the mobile station last registered when the data packet is sent to that mobile station network sends a page to the mobile station and the mobile station sends a page response to identify the cell where the package was sent. However, this is not the same as registering with a relay node list held by the node ID information on the terminal station and a relay source node included in the uplink packet that is stored in the core node and the relay node.

In Wallentin, the network sends a page to the mobile station (see col.6, ln. 17). On the other hand, according to the present invention, a down-link packet addressed to the terminal station reaches the terminal station without sending a page, because a node to which the down-link packet is to be relayed is described in a relay node list of each node for relaying the down-link packet. In Wallentin, a routing area

which is location information of the mobile station is managed by the network. On the other hand, according to the present invention, ID information on the terminal station and the node to which the down-link packet is to be relayed is managed for each node. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims and claim 19 are allowable over the cited reference.

Among the limitations of independent claim 18 not present in the cited reference is relay node list having recorded ID information on said terminal station and a relay source node included in the uplink packet directed towards said core node by said terminal station. Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, there is no disclosure in Wallentin of using a routing area on the basis of ID information. Additionally, in an effort to cure the noted deficiency in Wallentin, the Office Action includes Larsen for its teaching of a neighboring node maintaining a neighboring list for connecting and a neighboring list includes the destination IDs which is the final terminal destination. However, this is not the relay node list having recorded ID information explicitly recited in Applicant's claim. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Larsen fails to cure the deficiency in Wallentin noted in the Office Action.

Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Among the limitations of independent claim 20 not present in the cited reference is a relay node list of said core node or said relay node as a pair with ID information on a relay source node on said uplink packet in transmitting said uplink packet to a relay destination node. As discussed above, Wallentin fails to disclose setting ID information on a source terminal station registered with a relay node list. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: December 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY  
LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400  
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs